



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

United States Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/618,633	07/15/2003	Robert A. Kennewick	090611-0312470	5659
909 7590 07/22/2008 PILLSBURY WINTHROP SHAW PITTMAN, LLP P.O. BOX 10500 MCLEAN, VA 22102				
EXAMINER WOZNIAK, JAMES S				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
2626				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
07/22/2008		PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/618,633

Applicant(s)

KENNEWICK ET AL.

Examiner

JAMES S. WOZNIAK

Art Unit

2626

Period for Reply -- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 28 April 2008.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1, 2, 4, 6-8, 10-39 and 41-43 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1, 2, 4, 6-8, 10-39 and 41-43 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 15 July 2003 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
- Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
- Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

1. In response to the office action from 11/26/2007, the applicant has submitted a request for continued examination, filed 4/28/2008, amending independent claims 1 and 28, while arguing to traverse the art rejection based on the limitation regarding a speech recognition engine that performs recognition using data received from a plurality of domain agents and the claimed agent architecture (*Amendment, Pages 12-14*). Applicant's arguments have been fully considered, however the previous rejection is maintained due to the reasons listed below in the response to arguments.
2. In response to amended claims 36-37, the examiner has withdrawn the previous objection directed to minor informalities.
3. As no terminal disclaimer has been filed, the previous Double Patenting rejection is maintained.

Response to Arguments

4. Applicant's arguments have been fully considered but they are not persuasive for the following reasons:

With respect to the independent claims, the applicant argues that the prior art of record fails to teach:

a.) performing speech recognition using data received from a plurality of domain agents because it is alleged that Lin et al ("*A Distributed Architecture for Cooperative Spoken Dialogue Agents with Coherent Dialogue State and History*," 1999) teaches a domain independent acoustic recognition module (*Amendment, Page 13*); and

b.) sharing services of a plurality of domain agents because it is alleged that Lin indicates that domain knowledge and dialog control are handled in each spoken dialog agent (*Amendment, Pages 13-14*).

In response to argument a.), the examiner points out that Bennett et al (*U.S. Patent: 6,615,172*) teaches an acoustic recognition dictionary that varies based on a current dialog context (*Col. 27, Lines 17-51*). In Lin, these varying contexts are handled by spoken dialog agents (*SDAs- Fig. 3*). Thus, the combination of the prior art of record teaches the aforementioned claim limitation. Additionally, Lin teaches that domain or context dependent data from the SDAs is utilized in a graph search portion of a speech recognition process (*Figs. 2 and 5*). Thus, it should be noted that Lin also ultimately relies upon SDA domain data in performing speech recognition. Thus, this argument has been fully considered, but is not convincing for at least the preceding reasons.

In response to argument b.), the examiner points out that although Lin notes that the individual SDAs handle their own domain data, this data can be passed or shared from agent-to-agent as part of a switching protocol and dialog states/histories (*Sections 2.2-3.1*). For example, Fig. 3, shows various travel-related SDAs. If, for instance, a Train SDA wanted to determine the

weather for travel conditions, Lin's system could switch to the Train SDA and utilize its services to pass the desired weather data to the Train SDA ("*cooperation among the spoken dialog agents*", Section 3.1; and Fig. 6). In this *cooperative* manner, each SDA can utilize the services offered by the other SDAs. Thus, the applicant's arguments have been fully considered, but are not convincing.

With respect to Claim 2, the applicant further argues that Lin fails to teach an event manager that sends and receives events to components of the natural language speech processing system to coordinate interaction among those components because it is alleged that Lin teaches that domain switching is performed by a facilitator and not interaction coordination among the natural language speech processing system components (*Amendment, Page 14*). In response, the examiner notes that Lin's UIA, which has a facilitator, enables switching and the exchange of information (*i.e., coordination*) among the SDAs (*Sections 2.2 and 3.1*). The SDAs are part of the natural language processing system and thus, the UIA/facilitator (*i.e., event manager*) enables coordination among the natural language speech processing system components. It is further noted that Lin teaches SDA domain dependent components utilized in speech recognition and synthesis (*Fig. 2*), thus, the UIA/facilitator would also coordinate these components. Therefore, the applicant's arguments have been fully considered, but are not convincing.

The remainder of the dependent claims are traversed for reasons similar to the preceding claims (*Amendment, Pages 14-15*). In regards to such arguments, see the preceding response.

Claim Objections

5. **Claim 27** is objected to because of the following informalities:

In line 3, “the shared network resource” should be changed to –shared network resource-- , in order to provide proper antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Appropriate correction is required.

Double Patenting

6. The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the “right to exclude” granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. A nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting rejection is appropriate where the conflicting claims are not identical, but at least one examined application claim is not patentably distinct from the reference claim(s) because the examined application claim is either anticipated by, or would have been obvious over, the reference claim(s). See, e.g., *In re Berg*, 140 F.3d 1428, 46 USPQ2d 1226 (Fed. Cir. 1998); *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) or 1.321(d) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent either is shown to be commonly owned with this application, or claims an invention made as a result of activities undertaken within the scope of a joint research agreement.

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

7. **Claims 1 and 28**, are provisionally rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claim 44 of copending Application No. 10/452,147 in view of Lin et al ("*A Distributed Architecture for Cooperative Spoken Dialogue Agents with Coherent Dialogue State and History*," 1999). Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because both applications essentially refer to the same system/method. Although the present application additionally recites an event manager in the independent claims, this element would obvious in view of the teachings of Lin et al. Lin teaches discloses a user interface agent manager that enables query forwarding to a particular dialog agent for answer retrieval (*Sections 2.2- 3.1 and Fig. 3*) for the benefit of handling dialog across multiple subject domains (or applications) efficiently and intelligently (*Lin, Section 1*).

This is a provisional obviousness-type double patenting rejection because the conflicting claims have not in fact been patented.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

8. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

9. **Claims 1, 2, 4, 6, 13, 15-17, 22-23, 27-28, 31-32, and 41** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bennett et al (*U.S. Patent: 6,615,172*) in view of Lin et al ("*Distributed Architecture for Cooperative Spoken Dialogue Agents with Coherent Dialogue State and History*," 1999).

With respect to **Claim 1**, Bennett discloses:

A speech unit that receives a natural language speech utterance and encodes the user generated natural language speech utterance into an electronic signal, said user generated natural language speech utterance having at least one of a query and a command (*coding a spoken query*, Col. 10, Line 54- Col. 11, Line 17; and Col. 15, Line 53- Col. 16, Line 21);

A natural language speech processing system that receives, processes and response to the encoded natural language speech utterance using data received from a domain agent (*natural language processor that retrieves a query from a speech signal and forwards the question to a specific application portion to retrieve an answer*, Col. 24, Line 46- Col. 25, Line 67; Col. 27, Lines 17-51; and Col. 29, Line 30- Col. 30, Line 7; and agent, Col. 10, Line 54- Col. 11, Line 17), wherein the natural language speech processing system includes:

A speech recognition engine that recognizes at least one of words or phrases in the

Art Unit: 2626

encoded natural language speech utterance using the data received from a plurality of domains (*speech recognizer for recognizing query words/phrases that relies on context data from different domains, Col. 7, Lines 17-51*);

A parser that interprets the recognized words or phrases using the data received from the plurality of domains (*natural language understanding means, Col. 17, Lines 27-36*), wherein the parses interprets the recognized words or phrases by:

Determining a context for the natural language speech utterance (*natural language understanding means utilizing parsing to determine an application domain based on user speech content and context, Col. 11, Line 59- Col. 12, Line 10; Col. 17, Lines 28-67; and Col. 27, Lines 17-51*).

Selecting one of the contexts based on the determined contexts (*natural language speech processor that identifies a selects a grammar context, Col. 11, Lines 34-38; Col. 17, Lines 28-67; Col. 27, Lines 17-51; and Col. 29, Line 47- Col. 30, Line 2*); and

Transforming the recognized words or phrases into at least one of a question or a command, the at least one of said query and said command formulated in a grammar that the selected domain agent uses to process the formulated question or command (*natural language processor uses grammars that provides and generates the available user queries, Col. 11, Lines 34-38; Col. 17, Lines 28-67; and Col. 27, Lines 17-51*); and

A shared architecture between system components (*Col. 11, Lines 34-38*).

Although Bennett discloses processing a natural language query, forwarding the query to a specific application portion based on context, method use with multiple application domains (*Col. 29, Line 47-Col. 30, Line 2*), and answer generation (*Col. 24, Line 46- Col. 25, Line 67*;

Col. 27, Lines 17-51; and Col. 29, Line 30- Col. 30, Line 7), Bennett does not explicitly disclose the use of arbitrating means for selecting and forwarding a query to an executable dialog agents associated with different domains. Lin, however discloses a user interface agent manager that enables query forwarding to a particular dialog agent for answer retrieval (*Sections 2.2- 3.1 and Fig. 3*). Lin further teaches that each spoken dialogue agent (SDA) has access to the same set of Internet-enabled services and databases and functional system agents (*Fig. 2 and 3*). Also, each SDA can access information services as a result of a shared dialogue/state history (*Fig. 3*). In this cooperative case, an SDA can access services of all the SDAs through other SDAs via a switching routine (*"sends the dialogue state and history to the new SDA", Section 3.1*). Lin further teaches a non-acoustic speech recognition graph search portion that relies on domain specific data from the SDAs (*Lexicon, Grammar Rules, and Language Models, Fig. 2; and Fig. 5*). Finally, Lin teaches an architecture wherein a user interface agent receives responses from the specific SDAs and then transmits them to a user (*Figs. 2-3*).

Bennett and Lin are analogous art because they are from a similar field of endeavor in information retrieval systems utilizing speech recognition. Thus, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art, at the time of invention, to modify the teachings of Bennett with the interface agent architecture taught by Lin in order to handle dialog across multiple subject domains (or applications) efficiently and intelligently (*Lin, Section 1*).

With respect to **Claim 2**, Lin further discloses:

The natural language speech processing system further comprises an event manager, which sends and receives events to components of the natural language speech processing system to coordinate interaction between components of the natural language speech processing

system (*user interface agent having a facilitator, Fig. 3 that allows for passing information among other SDAs, Section 3.1*).

With respect to **Claim 4**, Bennett further discloses:

A text to speech engine that creates an encoded speech message to be annunciated to the user (*text-to-speech engine, Col. 10, Lines 54-67; text-to-sound file creation at a server, Col. 22, Lines 7-17; and answer is compressed, Col. 25, Lines 59-67*).

With respect to **Claim 6**, Lin further discloses dialog domain agents associated with travel information (*Fig. 3*).

With respect to **Claim 13**, Lin further discloses:

The communicatively coupled services include at least one remotely located service and the selected domain agent includes data for controlling or communicating with the remotely located service (*remote database and Internet services, which the SDAs are capable of communicating with or controlling, Fig. 3*).

With respect to **Claim 15**, Bennett further discloses:

The speech unit and the natural language speech processing system each include respective transceivers that communicate via a communication network (*client and server components with receiver/transmitter means for communicating over a network, Fig. 1*).

With respect to **Claim 16**, Bennett further discloses:

The communication network is a wide area wireless network (*large scale system employing a wireless communication medium, Col. 10, Lines 33-53*).

With respect to **Claim 17**, Bennett further discloses:

The transceiver is a wide-area RF transceiver (*RF link over a cellular network, Col. 10, Lines 33-53*).

With respect to **Claim 22**, Bennett further shows:

The speech unit is located remotely from the natural language speech processing system and the transceiver (*Fig. 1*).

With respect to **Claim 23**, Bennett further discloses a display (*Col. 10, Lines 54-65*).

With respect to **Claim 27**, Bennett discloses a network for cellular phones (*Col. 10, Lines 33-53*), while Lin recites a common database of dialog states/histories and network database shared across multiple common agents (*Fig. 3*).

Claim 28 recites subject matter similar to Claim 1, and thus, is rejected for the same reasons.

Claim 31 contains subject matter similar to claim 6, and thus, is rejected under similar rationale.

Claim 32 contains subject matter similar to claim 13, and thus, is rejected under similar rationale.

Claim 41 contains subject matter similar to claim 27, and thus, is rejected under similar rationale.

10. **Claims 7-8, 10-12, 30, and 38-39** rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bennett et al in view of Lin et al and further in view of Gerson (*U.S. Patent: 6,937,977*).

With respect to **Claims 7-8 and 10**, Bennett in view of Lin discloses dialog agents capable of retrieving responses to speech inputs for a number of different applications, as applied

to Claim 1. Bennett in view of Lin does not specifically disclose an application domain related to communicating with a vehicle device in order to enable device control. Gerson, however, discloses a vehicle control server application that recognizes a control command and communicates a command message back to a vehicle device to enable device control (*Col. 6, Line 66-Col. 7, Line 15*).

Bennett, Lin, and Gerson are analogous art because they are from a similar field of endeavor in speech-controlled systems. Thus, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art, at the time of invention, to modify the teachings of Bennett in view of Lin with the vehicle device control application taught by Gerson in order to increase system applicability by enabling its use for hands-free control of vehicle devices (*Gerson, Col. 6, Line 66- Col. 7, Line 15; and Col. 9, Lines 5-8*).

With respect to **Claim 11**, Gerson further shows the vehicle control application located remotely from a vehicle (*Fig. 1*).

With respect to **Claim 12**, Gerson further discloses control of a vehicle entertainment system and other vehicle devices (*Col. 6, Line 66- Col. 7, Line 15*).

Claim 30 contains subject matter similar to claim 10, and thus, is rejected under similar rationale.

With respect to **Claims 38-39**, Gerson further discloses an echo canceling block capable of eliminating echoes and noise in varying conditions that provides the benefit of preventing an echo from being recognized at a speech recognizer (*Col. 9, Line 24-Col. 10, Line 10*).

11. **Claim 14 and 33-37** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bennett et al in view of Lin et al and further in view of Hedin et al (*U.S. Patent: 6,185,535*).

With respect to **Claim 14**, Bennett in view of Lin discloses dialog agents capable of retrieving responses to speech inputs for a number of different applications, as applied to Claim 13. Bennett in view of Lin does not specifically disclose the communication of a recognized command with a remotely located specialized service application, however, Hedin discloses a speech recognizer that sends a recognized speech command message to an external service (*Col. 9, Line 36- Col. 10, Line 24; and Fig. 3, Elements 205, 207 and 307*).

Bennett, Lin, and Hedin are analogous art because they are from a similar field of endeavor in speech-controlled systems. Thus, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art, at the time of invention, to modify the teachings of Bennett in view of Lin with the remote service communication means taught by Hedin in order to enable access and control of remote server applications (*Hedin, Col. 2, Lines 39-42*).

With respect to **Claim 33**, Bennett in view of Lin discloses dialog agents capable of retrieving responses to speech inputs for a number of different applications, as applied to Claim 32. Bennett in view of Lin does not specifically disclose the communication of a recognized command/result with a remotely located service, however, Hedin discloses a speech recognizer that sends a recognized speech command message to an external service (*Col. 9, Line 36- Col. 10, Line 24; and Fig. 3, Elements 205, 207 and 307*).

Bennett, Lin, and Hedin are analogous art because they are from a similar field of endeavor in speech-controlled systems. Thus, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art, at the time of invention, to modify the teachings of Bennett in view of

Lin with the remote service communication means taught by Hedin in order to enable access and control of remote server applications (*Hedin, Col. 2, Lines 39-42*).

With respect to **Claim 34**, Hedin further discloses the remotely located server device as shown in Fig. 1b.

Claim 35 contains subject matter similar to Claim 15, and thus, is rejected for the same reasons.

Claim 36 contains subject matter similar to Claim 14, and thus, is rejected for the same reasons.

Claim 37 contains subject matter similar to Claim 17, and thus, is rejected for the same reasons.

12. **Claims 18, 20-21, and 29** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bennett et al in view of Lin et al and further in view of DeLine et al (*U.S. Patent: 6,420,975*).

With respect to **Claim 18 and 20**, Bennett in view of Lin discloses the dialog agent system capable of receiving and encoding a user speech input, as applied to Claim 1. Also, Bennett further discloses:

The speech unit includes a speech coder that encodes the natural language speech utterance into the electronic signal (*speech coding means, Col. 15, Line 53- Col.16, Line 21*), a microphone that receives the natural language speech utterance (*microphone, Col. 7, Lines 11-14*), and a filter that optimizes a SNR of the encoded natural language speech utterance (*digital filter used to enhance the input speech signal, Col. 15, Line 27- Col. 16, Line 21*).

Bennett in view of Lin does not specifically suggest that a speech input from a user is received via a one-dimensional microphone array, however DeLine discloses the use of such an array in a speech-enabled control system (*lined array of microphones, Col. 48, Lines 53-63*).

Bennett, Lin, and DeLine are analogous art because they are from a similar field of endeavor in speech-controlled systems. Thus, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art, at the time of invention, to modify the teachings of Bennett in view of Lin with the one dimensional microphone array taught by DeLine in order to enhance vocal signal content and eliminate acoustic noise (*DeLine, Col. 48, Lines 53-63*).

With respect to **Claim 21**, Bennett further discloses:

The speech coder uses an adaptive lossy audio compression (*speech encoding that includes only the least amount of information necessary to adequately and quickly complete speech recognition, Col. 15, Line 543- Col. 16, Line 21*).

Claim 29 contains subject matter similar to claim 18, and thus, is rejected under similar rationale.

13. **Claims 19 and 38-39** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bennett et al in view of Lin et al and further in view of DeLine et al and yet further in view of Gerson (*U.S. Patent: 6,937,977*).

With respect to **Claim 19**, Bennett in view of Lin and further in view of DeLine discloses the dialog agent system capable of receiving and encoding a user speech input, as applied to Claim 18. The aforementioned prior art does not explicitly teach adaptive echo cancellation, however, Gerson, in an analogous field of art in speech-controlled systems, teaches an echo

canceled block capable of eliminating echoes and noise in varying conditions that provides the added benefit to the other prior art of preventing an echo from being recognized at a speech recognizer (*Col. 9, Line 24-Col. 10, Line 10*).

With respect to **Claims 38-39**, Gerson further discloses an echo canceling block capable of eliminating echoes and noise in varying conditions that provides the benefit of preventing an echo from being recognized at a speech recognizer (*Col. 9, Line 24-Col. 10, Line 10*).

14. **Claims 24-26 and 42-43** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bennett et al in view of Lin et al and further in view of Turnbull et al (*U.S. Patent: 6,980,092*).

With respect to **Claims 24-25**, Bennett in view of Lin discloses the speech interactive system, as applied to Claim 1. Bennett in view of Lin does not specifically suggest system implementation in a telematics control unit. Turnbull, however, discloses implementation of a speech interactive system embedded in a telematics device (*speech recognition processing, Col. 30, Line 43- Col. 31, Line 2, in an in-vehicle telematics assembly, Col. 29, Lines 56-63; controlling in-vehicle devices in response to recognized voice commands, Col.28, Line 53- Col. 29, Line 36, Col. 30, Line 43- Col. 31, Line 2, and Col. 36, Lines 57-63; and control bus for sending control signals to the various vehicle devices, Fig. 11, Element 102*).

Bennett, Lin, and Turnbull are analogous art because they are from a similar field of endeavor in speech-controlled systems. Thus, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art, at the time of invention, to modify the teachings of Bennett in view of Lin with the telematics unit taught by Turnbull in order to implement a speech communication and control system that can be readily installed in a vehicle (*Turnbull, Col. 3, Lines 20-22*).

With respect to **Claim 26**, Turnbull discloses the in-vehicle telematics unit as applied to Claims 24-25.

Claim 42 contains subject matter similar to claim 24, and thus, is rejected under similar rationale.

With respect to **Claim 43**, Turnbull further discloses remote network resources located at a different location than a vehicle (*Col. 35, Lines 48-67*).

Conclusion

15. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure: See PTO-892.

16. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to James S. Wozniak whose telephone number is (571) 272-7632. The examiner can normally be reached on M-Th, 7:30-5:00, F, 7:30-4, Off Alternate Fridays.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Patrick Edouard can be reached at (571) 272-7603. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 2626

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

/James S. Wozniak/
Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2626